arXiv:1512.06401v1 [math.NT] 20 Dec 2015

Deterministic factorization of sums and differences of powers

Markus Hittmeir
University of Salzburg
Mathematics Department

Abstract

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed and coprime such that $a > b$, and let N be any number of the form $a^n \pm b^n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We will generalize a result of Bostan, Gaudry and Schost [BGS07] and prove that we may compute the prime factorization of N in

$$\mathcal{O}\Big(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}\Big(N^{1/4}\sqrt{\log N}\Big)\Big),$$

$\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(k)$ denoting the cost for multiplying two k-bit integers. This result is better than the currently best known general bound for the runtime complexity for deterministic integer factorization.

1 Introduction

In [CH14] it has been proven that the deterministic and unconditional runtime complexity to compute the prime factorization of any natural number N is in

$$\mathcal{O}\Big(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}\Big(\frac{N^{1/4}\log N}{\sqrt{\log\log N}}\Big)\Big),$$

where $\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(k)$ denotes the cost for multiplying two k-bit integers. $\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(k)$ can be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(k \log k 2^{\log^* k})$, where $\log^* k$ denotes the iterated logarithm (See [F09]). The proof in [CH14] improves the well known approach of Strassen, which has been presented in [S77]. The main idea of both methods is to use fast polynomial evaluation for computing parts of $\lfloor N^{1/2} \rfloor !$ to find a nontrivial factor of N.

The author is supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF): Project F5504-N26.
Address: Hellbrunnerstraße 34, A-5020 Salzburg. E-Mail: markus.hittmeir@sbg.ac.at
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 11A51.
Key words and phrases: Factorization, Primes.

In this paper, we will also apply this idea and combine it with a result of [H15] to improve the bound for numbers of certain shape, namely for sums and differences of powers. Our main theorem is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ be fixed and coprime such that $a > b$, and define $P_{a,b} := \{a^n \pm b^n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then, we may compute the prime factorization of any $N \in P_{a,b}$ in*

$$\mathcal{O}\Big(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}\Big(N^{1/4}\sqrt{\log N}\Big)\Big)$$

bit operations.

We would like to point out that the theorem applies to some interesting subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, like Mersenne numbers or Fermat numbers.

2 Preliminaries

We briefly introduce the notions and results we will use in Section 3 to prove Theorem 1.1. The following definitions describe the invertibility conditions required for fast polynomial evaluation provided by Theorem 2.4. They have been first introduced in [BGS07]. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_N := \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$.

Definition 2.1. Let $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_N$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that $\mathsf{h}(\alpha, \beta, d)$ is satisfied if the elements

$$\beta, 2, ..., d, (\alpha - d\beta), (\alpha - (d-1)\beta), ..., (\alpha + d\beta)$$

are invertible modulo N, and we define

$$\mathsf{d}(\alpha, \beta, d) = \beta 2 \cdots d(\alpha - d\beta)(\alpha - (d-1)\beta) \cdots (\alpha + d\beta).$$

$\mathsf{h}(\alpha, \beta, d)$ holds if and only if $\mathsf{d}(\alpha, \beta, d)$ is invertible.

Definition 2.2. Let $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_N$ and $e \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that $\mathsf{H}(2^e, \beta)$ is satisfied if $\mathsf{h}(2^i, \beta, 2^i)$ and $\mathsf{h}((2^i+1)\beta, \beta, 2^i)$ hold for each $0 \le i < e$. We define

$$\mathsf{D}(2^e, \beta) = \prod_{i=0}^{e-1} \mathsf{d}(2^i, \beta, 2^i)\mathsf{d}((2^i+1)\beta, \beta, 2^i).$$

$\mathsf{H}(2^e, \beta)$ holds if and only if $\mathsf{D}(2^e, \beta)$ is invertible.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $f_0, ..., f_{k-1} \in \mathbb{Z}_N$. Then we can decide if all f_i are invertible modulo N and, if not, find a noninvertible f_i in*

$$\mathcal{O}(k\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N) + \log k\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N)\log\log N)$$

bit operations.

Proof. See Lemma 12 in [BGS07] for a proof. □

Now let $H \in \mathbb{Z}_N[X]$ with $\deg H = 1$. We define

$$H_k(X) = H(X)H(X+1)\cdots H(X+k-1).$$

Our main ingredients are the following two theorems.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_N$, $e \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k = 2^e$. Assume that $\mathsf{H}(k,\beta)$ holds and that the inverse of $\mathsf{D}(k,\beta)$ is known. We may compute*

$$H_k(\beta), H_k(2\beta)..., H_k(k\beta)$$

in $\mathcal{O}(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(k\log(kN)) + \mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N))$ bit operations.

Proof. Apply Proposition 7 in [CH14] with $\rho = 1$. □

Theorem 2.5. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be composite and p a prime factor of N with $p \leq b$ for some $b \leq N/5$. If $r, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2 \leq m < p$, $\gcd(N,m) = 1$ and $r = p \mod m$, then the sets*

$$\{m^{-1}r - n \mod N : 1 \leq n \leq k\}$$
$$\{-nk \mod N : 1 \leq n \leq k\}$$

with $k = \lceil (b/m)^{1/2} \rceil$ are disjoint and there exist $i, j \in \{1, ..., k\}$ such that $m^{-1}r - i \equiv -jk \mod p$.

Proof. A proof can be found in [H15], Corollary 4.4. □

Corollary 2.6. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be composite and p a prime factor of N such that $p \leq b$ for some $b \leq N/5$. Let $r, m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $2 \leq m < p$, $\gcd(N,m) = 1$ and $r = p \mod m$. Furthermore, define $H = X - m^{-1}r + 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_N[X]$ and set $k = \lceil (b/m)^{1/2} \rceil$. Then at least one of the elements*

$$H_k(-k), H_k(-2k)..., H_k(-k^2)$$

is noninvertible modulo N. Let $j \in \{1, ..., k\}$ such that $H_k(-jk)$ is noninvertible, then $\gcd(-jk - m^{-1}r + i \mod N, N)$ yields a nontrivial factor of N for some $i \in \{1, ..., k\}$.

Proof. Theorem 2.5 yields that there must exist $i, j \in \{1, ..., k\}$ such that $m^{-1}r - i \equiv -jk \mod p$. This implies that the element $-jk - m^{-1}r + i$ is noninvertible modulo N. Hence, we conclude that the same holds for $H_k(-jk) = \prod_{l=1}^{k} -jk - m^{-1}r + l$. Since the sets in Theorem 2.5 are disjoint, we get $p \mid \gcd(-jk - m^{-1}r + i \mod N, N) \neq N$, which proves the claim. □

Lemma 2.7. *Let N be a natural number and $r, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \geq 2$ such that $r = p \mod m$ for every prime divisor p of N. Let $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $b := 4^e m \leq N/5$. Knowing r and m, one can compute a prime divisor p of N with $p \leq b$ or prove that no such divisor exists in*

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(2^e \log(N)) + e\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N) \log\log N)$$

bit operations.

Proof. If $m \geq q$ for the smallest prime factor q of N, then $m = q$ or $r = q$. Assume $m < q$. Set $k := 2^e = \sqrt{b/m}$ and define $H = X - m^{-1}r + 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_N[X]$. We want to apply Theorem 2.4 with $\beta = -k$ to compute the values

$$H_k(-k), H_k(-2k)..., H_k(-k^2).$$

In order to do this, we have to check if $\mathsf{H}(k, -k)$ holds. It is easy to see that this the case if and only if $2, 3, ..., 2^e + 1$ and

$$(2^i - 2^i 2^e), (2^i - (2^i - 1)2^e), ..., (2^i + 2^i 2^e)$$

are invertible modulo N for each $0 \leq i < e$. This list consists of $\mathcal{O}(k)$ easily computable elements in $\mathbb{Z}_N$, whose absolute values are bounded by $2^{e-1} + 2^{e-1}2^e < 4^e < b \leq N/5$. Hence, they are all nonzero modulo N. By Lemma 2.3, we are able to decide if all of them are invertible modulo N or, if not, find a noninvertible one in

$$\mathcal{O}(k\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N) + \log k\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N) \log\log N).$$

Assume that we have found a noninvertible element, than we have also found a nontrivial factor of N bounded by $k^2 = 4^e$. We are able to find a prime divisor of N using trial division in $\mathcal{O}(k\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N))$ bit operations. In this case, the result is proven. Now assume that all of the elements above are noninvertible. We are able to compute $\mathsf{D}(k, -k) \in \mathbb{Z}_N$ in $\mathcal{O}(k\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N))$ bit operations. The cost for computing its inverse are negligible. We now apply Theorem 2.5 to compute $H_k(-nk)$ for $n = 1, ..., k$, and since $k < N$, we can do this in

$$\mathcal{O}(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(k \log(N)) + \mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N))$$

bit operations. Suppose that N has a prime factor $p \leq b$ with $r = p \mod m$. Then by Corollary 2.6, there exists at least one $j \in \{1, ..., k\}$ such that $H_k(-jk)$ is noninvertible modulo N. Using Lemma 2.3, we can find such an element in

$$\mathcal{O}(k\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N) + \log k\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N) \log\log N).$$

Let $H_k(-jk)$ be noninvertible modulo N, then Corollary 2.6 yields that $\gcd(-jk - m^{-1}r + i \mod N, N)$ is nontrivial for some $i \in \{1, ..., k\}$. Applying Lemma 2.3 again, we are able to find such $-jk - m^{-1}r + i \mod N$ in

$$\mathcal{O}(k\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N) + \log k\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N) \log\log N)$$

bit operations. We know that $\gcd(-jk - m^{-1}r + i \mod N, N)$ is divisible by a prime divisor p of N. This implies $-jk - m^{-1}r + i \equiv 0 \mod p$, hence $0 \equiv mjk + r - mi \mod p$. We derive that $\gcd(mjk + r - mi, N)$ is nontrivial. The value $mjk + r - mi$ is bounded by $mk^2 + r - m < mk^2 = b$. Again, we use trial division to find a prime divisor of N. There are less than k primes p smaller than $\lceil\sqrt{b}\rceil$ satisfying $r = p \mod m$, since they have to be of the form $mx + r$ for $x \in \{0, ..., \lceil k/\sqrt{m}\rceil - 1\}$. Therefore, the trial division can be done by $\mathcal{O}(k\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N))$ bit operations. This proves the claim. □

Theorem 2.8. *Let $N \geq 400$ be a natural number and $r, m \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \geq 2$ such that $r = p \mod m$ for every prime divisor p of N. Knowing r and m, one can compute the prime factorization of N in*

$$\mathcal{O}\Big(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}\Big(\frac{N^{1/4}}{\sqrt{m}} \log N\Big)\Big)$$

bit operations.

Proof. We apply Lemma 2.7 with $b = 4^e m$ for $e \in \mathbb{N}$, starting with $e = 1$. Lemma 2.7 is applied with the same value of b until no prime divisor of N smaller than b is found. Then we increase e by 1 and repeat. We do this until $b \geq \sqrt{N}$. Since $N \geq 400$, b is always bounded by $4\sqrt{N} \leq N/5$.

If we run Lemma 2.7 with value b, all prime divisors smaller than $b/4$ have already been detected. Since their product is bounded by N, we derive that the number of prime divisors between $b/4$ and b and hence the number of runs of Lemma 2.7 with the same value b is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\log N/\log b)$. The sum of all the terms of the form $e\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(\log N)\log\log N)$ in the runtime complexity of Lemma 2.7 is bounded by a polynomial in $\log N$ and hence negligible. We consider the sum of the other terms. Since $4^e m \geq \sqrt{N}$ implies $e \geq (\log N)/4 - (\log m)/2$, we define $e_0 := \lceil(\log N)/4 - (\log m)/2\rceil$ and get

$$\sum_{i=1}^{e_0} \frac{\log N}{\log(4^i m)} \mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(2^i \log(N)) \leq \mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}\Big(\log N \sum_{i=1}^{e_0} \Big\lceil \frac{\log N}{2i + \log m} \Big\rceil 2^i\Big).$$

Note that the inequality is a consequence of the facts that $k \leq \mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(k)$ and $\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(k) + \mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(k') \leq \mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(k + k')$.

Now we split the sum on the right side into $i \leq e_0/2$ and $i > e_0/2$. For $i \leq e_0/2$ we have $2^i \leq 2^{e_0/2} \in \mathcal{O}(N^{1/8}/m^{1/4})$, hence the first part of the sum is bounded by $\mathcal{O}((\log N)^2(N^{1/8}/m^{1/4}))$ and therefore negligible. We consider the main contribution by the summands with $i > e_0/2$. In these cases we have $2i+\log m > (\log N)/4-(\log m)/2+\log m > (\log N)/4$, hence the terms $\lceil \log N/(2i+\log m)\rceil$ are in $\mathcal{O}(1)$. We conclude that this part of the sum can be bounded by

$$\mathcal{O}(2^{e_0}) = \mathcal{O}(2^{\lceil (\log N)/4-(\log m)/2\rceil}) = \mathcal{O}(N^{1/4}/\sqrt{m}).$$

which proves the claim. □

Remark 2.9. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be odd. If we apply Lemma 2.7 and Theorem 2.8 with $m = 2$ and $r = 1$, we get the results of Lemma 13 and Theorem 11 in [BGS07].

3 Algorithm and Proof

Let $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed and coprime such that $a > b$. We are interested in elements of $P^+_{a,b} := \{a^n + b^n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and $P^-_{a,b} := \{a^n - b^n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. We define $P_{a,b} := P^+_{a,b} \cup P^-_{a,b}$ and consider the following algorithm:

Algorithm 3.1. *Let $N \in P_{a,b}$. We can write either $N = a^m + b^m \in P^+_{a,b}$ or $N = a^m - b^m \in P^-_{a,b}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $v := 1$ and take the following steps to compute the prime factorization of N:*

1. *Apply trial division to remove all prime factors smaller than 400 from N. Denote the resulting number by N_0. If $N \in P^+_{a,b}$, then set $N_1 = N_0$. If $N \in P^-_{a,b}$, apply trial division to compute the prime factorization of $a-b$, remove all prime factors dividing $a-b$ from N_0 and denote the resulting number by N_1.*

2. *Apply trial division to compute all divisors of m. If $N \in P^+_{a,b}$, define $\mathcal{D} := \{2d : d \mid m\}$. If $N \in P^-_{a,b}$, define $\mathcal{D} := \{d : d \mid m\}$. For $l \geq 2$, let $d_1 < d_2 < ... < d_l$ be the ordered list of all elements in $\mathcal{D}$.*

3. *Set $j = v$.*

4. *Compute $G_j = \gcd((ab^{-1})^{d_j} - 1 \mod N_j, N_j)$. If $G_j = 1$, then set $N_{j+1} = N_j$. If $1 < G_j \leq N$, apply Theorem 2.8 for $m = d_j$ and $r = 1$ to compute the prime factorization of G_j, remove all prime factors dividing G_j from N_j and denote the resulting number by N_{j+1}. If $N_{j+1} = 1$, stop. If not, set $v = j + 1$ and go to Step 3.*

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We have to prove that the algorithm is correct and runs in $\mathcal{O}(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(N^{1/4}\sqrt{\log N}))$.

First note that $N \in P^+_{a,b}$ implies $(ab^{-1})^{2m} \equiv 1 \mod N$ and $N \in P^-_{a,b}$ implies $(ab^{-1})^m \equiv 1 \mod N$. Hence, we have $N_{l+1} = 1$ in any case and the algorithm always terminates.

To prove correctness, it remains to show that the conditions in Theorem 2.8 are always satisfied. Let $i \in \{1, ..., l\}$ be arbitrary. If $N \in P^-_{a,b}$, prime factors dividing $a - b$ have already been removed in Step 1, hence $1 < G_i$ implies $d_i \geq 2$. Furthermore, all prime factors smaller than 400 have been removed in Step 1, hence $1 < G_i$ implies $G_i \geq 400$. Let p be any prime factor of G_i. We now have to prove that $1 = p \mod d_i$. If $N \in P^-_{a,b}$, then $(ab^{-1})^m \equiv 1 \mod p$. Hence, the order o of the element ab^{-1} modulo p is a divisor of m. We derive $o \in \mathcal{D}$. If $N \in P^+_{a,b}$, then $(ab^{-1})^m \equiv -1 \mod p$ and $(ab^{-1})^{2m} \equiv 1 \mod p$. Hence, the order o of the element ab^{-1} modulo p is of the form $2d$ for some divisor d of m. Again, we derive $o \in \mathcal{D}$. Now since p divides G_i, we deduce $(ab^{-1})^{d_i} \equiv 1 \mod p$. Furthermore, p divides N_i and therefore has not been removed as prime factor in the previous steps. But this implies $(ab^{-1})^{d_j} \not\equiv 1 \mod p$ for $1 \leq j < i$, and we conclude that $o = d_i$. Since the order of any element is a divisor of the group order $p - 1$, we derive $p \equiv 1 \mod d_i$ and the claim follows.

We now consider the runtime of the algorithm. The cost for Step 1 is in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ and negligible. We are left with the task to discuss the runtime of Step 2 and Step 4.

Step 2: Note that $N \geq a^m - b^m \geq (b+1)^m - b^m \geq b^{m-1}$. This implies $m \leq \log_b N + 1 = \log N / \log b + 1 \in \mathcal{O}(\log N)$ for $b \neq 1$. For $b = 1$, it is also easy to show that m is bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$. Hence, the cost to compute all divisors of m and to bring them into the right order can be bounded by $\mathcal{O}((\log N)^{1+\epsilon})$ and is negligible.

Step 4: The cardinality of $\mathcal{D}$ can be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$. The cost for computing the greatest common divisors is negligible. Assume the computational worst case, in which we have to apply Theorem 2.8 for every $j \in \{1, ..., l\}$. We consider $1 \leq j < l$. Then we have $a^{d_j} \equiv b^{d_j} \mod G_j$, hence $G_j \mid a^{d_j} - b^{d_j}$. If $N \in P^-_{a,b}$, we can write $d_j = m/k$ for some $k \geq 2$, and we deduce that

$$G_j \leq a^{d_j} - b^{d_j} = a^{m/k} - b^{m/k} \leq (a^m - b^m)^{1/k} \leq (a^m - b^m)^{1/2} = N^{1/2}.$$

As a consequence, the runtime of all the applications of Theorem 2.8 for $1 \leq j < l$ can be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(N^{1/8}(\log N)) \log N)$ and is negligible.

If $N \in P^+_{a,b}$, then we have $d_j = 2m/k$ for some $k \geq 2$. Note that $G_j > 1$ implies $d_j \neq m$, since $a^m \equiv -b^m \not\equiv b^m \mod p$ for every prime factor p of N. We deduce that $k > 2$ and therefore

$$G_j \leq a^{d_j} - b^{d_j} = a^{\frac{2m}{k}} - b^{\frac{2m}{k}} \leq (a^m - b^m)^{\frac{2}{k}} \leq (a^m - b^m)^{\frac{2}{3}} < (a^m + b^m)^{\frac{2}{3}} = N^{2/3}.$$

We hence conclude that in this case the runtime of all the applications of Theorem 2.8 for $1 \leq j < l$ can be bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(N^{1/6}(\log N))\log N)$ and is negligible.

We now consider the runtime of Theorem 2.8 for $j = l$. First note that $N \leq a^m + b^m < 2a^m$ implies $m > \log_a N - \log_a 2 = \log N / \log a - \log_a 2$, which is in $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$. Hence, m and $2m$ are both lower bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$. Assume the computational worst case, in which we have $G_l = N$. Then, the runtime is in

$$\mathcal{O}\Big(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}\Big(\frac{N^{1/4}}{\sqrt{\log N}}\log N\Big)\Big) = \mathcal{O}(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}(N^{1/4}\sqrt{\log N})).$$

This proves the result. □

Corollary 3.2. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be a Mersenne number or a Fermat number. Then $N \in P_{2,1}$ and we may compute the prime factorization of N in $\mathcal{O}\Big(\mathsf{M}_{\text{int}}\Big(N^{1/4}\sqrt{\log N}\Big)\Big)$.*

References

[CH14] E. Costa, D. Harvey, *Faster deterministic integer factorization*, Math. Comp. 83, Pages 339-345, 2014.

[H15] M. Hittmeir, *Digit Polynomials and their application to integer factorization*, http://arxiv.org/abs/1501.03078.

[BGS07] A. Bostan, P. Gaudry, É. Schost, *Linear recurrences with polynomial coefficients and application to integer factorization and Cartier-Manin operator*, SIAM J. Comput., 36(6):1777-1806, 2007.

[S77] V. Strassen, *Einige Resultate über Berechnungskomplexität*, Jahresbericht der Deutschen Mathematiker-Vereinigung, Pages 1-8, 1976/77.

[F09] M. Fürer, *Faster integer multiplication*, SIAM J. Comput. 39(3):979-1005, 2009.